

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

<b>In re Application of:</b>	James W. Morrow <i>et al.</i>	<b>Examiner:</b>	Patel, Niketa I.
<b>Application No.:</b>	09/746,854	<b>Group Art Unit:</b>	2181
<b>Filing Date:</b>	December 22, 2000	<b>Confirmation No.</b>	7292
<b>Office Action Date:</b>	October 5, 2006	<b>Docket No.</b>	83336-476
<b>Title:</b>	SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING REAL TIME CONTROL OF PERIPHERAL DEVICES		
		<b>Customer No.</b>	30076

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action of October 5, 2006, and is timely filed with a one-month extension of time.

**INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which the Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-4, 6-20, 22-27 and 29-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swales *et al.* (US 6,233,626) and further in view of Montijo (US 6,052,107). Claims 1-11, 12-18, 19-23, and 24-34 stand provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 12-18, 19-23, and 24-34 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/956,431 in view of Montijo (US 6,052,107).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Applicants respectfully contend that the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the cited references.